

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
Group Art Unit: 2127  
Examiner: Ali, Syed, J.

June 4, 2003

Confirmation No. 3674  
Serial No. 09/468,469  
Filed: 12/21/1999  
Inventor: Reginald V. Blue  
Title: ARCHITECTURE FOR A READ/WRITE THREAD LOCK  
Attorney File No.: TN-172

Mail Stop DAC  
Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**1st AMENDMENT**

Dear Sir,

This is responsive to the Official Communication of 11/19/2002, rejecting all claims under sections 102 or 103. A petition to revive an unintentionally abandoned application is filed herewith making this submission timely with the acceptance of the Petition and the payment of the associated fee.

If any further extension of time is required, please consider this a request therefore. If any additional fees are required, charge Deposit Account No. 19-3790.

The claims are amended as required under the new amendment rules.

**Specification Amendment**

FIG. 43 11 shows a case in which two writing threads, writer 1 and writer 2, need to write to the same resource. Writer 1 requests a write lock at step 91(1), and writer 2 requests a write lock at step 91(2), which occurs slightly later in time than step 91(1). Because two threads are not permitted to write to a resource at the same time, writer 1 is permitted to proceed, while writer 2 must wait until writer 1 is finished. In the example

**Attorney's Docket No. TN172**  
**1st Amendment****Serial No. 09/468,469**

depicted in FIG. 9, writing thread proceeds to acquire a lock, write data to the resource, and release the lock, at steps 92(1)-94(1). Writer 2 waits until writer 1 has completed step 94(1) before proceeding to acquire a lock at step 92(2), write data to the resource at step 93(2), and release the lock at step 94(2). As discussed above in connection with FIG. 7, since writer 1 and writer 2 both issued their lock requests before either was granted, there is no logical reason why writer 1's lock request must be granted before writer 2's request. However, in the implementation discussed above, which is only one of many possible implementations of the invention, writer 1 acquired the WRITE critical section as soon as writer 1 issued a lock request, thereby preventing writer 2 from acquiring a lock until writer 1 released the lock (and thus the WRITE critical section) at step 94(1).